

Funding Formula Sheet
State of New Mexico
LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE

REPRESENTATIVES

Rick Miera, Chair
Roberto "Bobby" J. Gonzales
Jimmie C. Hall
Mimi Stewart
Thomas E. Swisstack
W. C. "Dub" Williams

State Capitol North, 325 Don Gaspar, Suite 200
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501
PH: (505) 986-4591 FAX: (505) 986-4338
<http://legis.state.nm.us/lcs/lesc/lescdefault.asp>

SENATORS

Cynthia Nava, Vice Chair
Vernon D. Asbill
Mary Jane M. Garcia
Gay G. Kernan

ADVISORY

Andrew J. Barreras
Ray Begaye
Nathan P. Cote
Nora Espinoza
Mary Helen Garcia
Thomas A. Garcia
Dianne Miller Hamilton
John A. Heaton
Sheryl M. Williams Stapleton
Jim R. Trujillo
Teresa A. Zanetti



**RECEIVED
VIA E-MAIL**

AUG 05 2008

ADVISORY

Mark Boitano
Carlos R. Cisneros
Dianna J. Duran
Lynda M. Lovejoy
Howie C. Morales
John Pinto
William E. Sharer

D. Pauline Rindone, Ph.D., Director
Frances R. Maestas, Deputy Director

June 19, 2008

MEMORANDUM

TO: Public School District Superintendents

FR: D. Pauline Rindone

**RE: PROPOSED FUNDING FORMULA DISCUSSIONS - GRANTS-CIBOLA
COUNTY SCHOOLS**

In April, you received a memorandum from the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) inviting you to work with the committee to examine the potential impact of the new public school funding formula that was proposed during the 2008 legislative session. Attachment 1 is a table indicating the meeting at which your district is scheduled to discuss the proposed funding formula with the committee - a meeting agenda with the exact time and date for your presentation will be sent to you prior to that meeting.

At the LESC meeting for which you have been scheduled, LESC staff will present your district's calculator and you will discuss with the committee how the proposed funding formula would affect your school district's operations and its ability to accommodate the needs of your students, as well as other issues related to the proposed funding formula. Hard copies of the calculators for the districts in your group will be available for reference and discussion.

In order to facilitate the discussions, LESC staff, with the assistance of the Public Education Department (PED), have prepared the following questions, which will also be provided to the committee. The questions are a guide to assist you in preparing for your discussions with the committee. We understand that you may or may not be able to have complete answers to some of these questions prior to the meeting; however, it is important that we receive written responses to these questions from each of you. If you are not able to respond immediately, please send a copy of your responses to me as soon as you are able to gather the information, and please include the name of your district with the responses.

Programs and Services:

1. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula affect your district's program cost?

The allocation of the proposed funding formula will enhance current programs and enable us to implement proposed programs to affectively meet the needs of all stakeholders.

Demographics:

> The Grants/Cibola County School District encompasses most of Cibola County (4,539.21 sq. mi.), which has a population of approximately 28,549 residents. The school district boundaries begin approximately 40 west of Albuquerque and extends 20 miles west of Grants.

>The school district serves a population of 3,61 Pre-K to 12 student population. (120th day student attendance count as of February 27, 2008

> 10 school (7 Elementary Schools, 1 Middle School, 1 High School, 1 Jr./Sr. High School)

>41.8% or 1,514 Native American students from the Acoma Pueblo, Laguna Pueblo, Navajo Nation, and other tribal representations

> 37.8% or 1,370 Hispanic students

>18.3% or 674 Anglo students

>1.1% Afro-American, (42) Asian (12), Other Ethnic representation

> 94.68% Student Attendance (NM 2007 School Accountability Report, NM state rate-92%)

> 91.54% Graduation Rate (NM 2007 School Accountability Report, NM state rate-90%)

> 295 certified K-12 Educators; 290 Support Staff (Maintenance, Transportation, Food Service, Education Assistants, Custodians, Clerical/Secretarial/Technicians

> Administration: Superintendent, 10 Principals, 2 Assistant Principals1 Director of Personnel, Director of Business & Finance, Director of Indian Education, Director of Federal/Bilingual Programs, Director of Special Education, Director of Athletics, Director of Facilities, Director of Technology ,Coordinators for, Nursing/Health Services, Food Services, Transportation, STARS/Testing, Maintenance Support Staff: Dean of Students, Truancy Officer

>73% Free/Reduced Lunch students

>2,107 approximate total bus miles per day/unpaved road mileage is 23.2

2. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula impact the educational programs and student services provided by your district?

a) Educational Programs:

- Before/after/summer school programs (Remediation & Enrichment)
 1. Funding for staff at an effective student/teacher ratio for each of the 10 schools
 2. Research-based programs for remediation and enrichment for each school
 3. Projects and activities for enrichment and expanding knowledge and skills
 4. Resources for implementation and maintenance
 5. Transportation and nutrition for students
 6. Professional development on programs and strategies for remediation and enrichment – to include cultural awareness

7. Credit Recovery funding
- Intervention Programs – Reading & Math K-12
 1. Intervention Specialists in reading and math
 2. Technology Resources
 3. Scientifically research-based programs
 4. Professional development on programs and strategies for intervention
- Career Programs K-12 - School to Work
 1. Software/media programs
 2. Presentations by guest speakers
 3. Field trips to support career programs
 4. Transportation
- Dual Credit Enrollment
 1. Transportation for classes with college branches
 2. Tuition for classes
 3. Funds for textbooks and materials
- Distance Learning (teacher coordinated)
 1. Technology equipment
 2. Staffing for labs
 3. Software and/or textbooks
 4. Program costs
- Health & Wellness education (students and staff)
 1. Additional certified and trained nursing staff
 2. Staffing for recreational/intramural programs
 3. Educational programs for health and wellness (staff and students)
- Advanced Placement Program
 1. Staffing
 2. Resources
 3. Professional Development
 4. AVID (Advancement Via Individual Determination)

b) Student Services:

- Social Workers to coordinate services
 1. Licensed staff
 2. Service attendance and truancy issues
 3. Home visits
 4. Family services (referral to resources)
 5. Parent/family education
 6. Coordinate between state services and school staff
 7. Professional development
- Counselors (mental health services & guidance)
 1. Licensed mental health providers
 2. Additional counseling staff
- Student Assistance Team/ 504 Specialists/Facilitators
 1. Manage SAT/504 referrals
 2. Schedule and attend all meetings
 3. Input information into network
 4. Maintain files and paperwork
 5. Support and coach for in-class implementation
 6. Coordinate with appropriate staff

- SPED Support
 1. Behavioral interventionists
 2. Transition specialists
 3. Psychologists
 4. Additional assistants for existing program
 5. Additional staff for gifted program
 6. Professional development
- IEP Facilitators
 1. Certified specialists to facilitate special education meetings
 - Coordinate all facets of IEPs
 - Provide training to other staff
 2. Technology equipment
- Family Involvement Nights
 1. Access to computers
 2. Library resources
 3. Homework assistance
 4. Tutorials
 5. Health and Wellness awareness
 6. Funding
- Attendance incentives
 1. Funding

3. Will your district use the additional funding resulting from the implementation of the proposed funding formula to reduce class size? If so, what grades, and how many classrooms would be affected?

Yes, by using data to support reducing class size and providing appropriate implementation of programs as necessary. Funding could be used to balance class size not average.

4. What other changes might your district consider as a result of additional funding?

- Year Round School/Modified student/teacher work week
- Freshmen Academy
- Restructuring (6, 7, 8 grades)
- Professional resources, online journal subscriptions, and research data bases
- Appropriate staff, equipment, secured technology to provide safe school environments
- Additional professional development days & training
 1. Vertical/Horizontal Alignment in all core areas
 2. Facilitated Support

5. How will your district ensure that it provides all of the following educational programs and services as required in the funding formula bill, as amended, during the session?

- Bilingual and multicultural education, including culturally relevant learning environments, educational opportunities, and culturally relevant instructional materials;
 1. GCCS will continue to support and improve existing programs
- Health and wellness, including physical education, athletics, nutrition, and health education;
 1. GCCS will support and implement programs as addressed on Pages 2 and 3 under 2. a. Educational Programs
- Career-technical education;
 1. GCCS will support and implement programs as addressed on Pages 2 and 3 under 2. a. Educational Programs
- Visual and performing arts and music;
 1. GCCS will continue to support and improve existing programs
- Gifted education, advanced placement, and honors programs;
 1. Add additional staff for gifted and advanced placement programs
- Special education;
 1. Continue supporting and expanding current programs that have been added for the 2008-2009 school year, on Page 3 under 2. b. Student Services
- Distance education;
 1. GCCS will implement and fund distance education on Page 3, under 2. a. Educational Programs

6. To the best of your ability at this time, please fill in the table below to identify the additional state-funded FTE that your district would be able to provide as a result of the implementation of the proposed funding formula:

Personnel	Elementary	Middle	High	Current FTE	Proposed FTE
Teachers	4			178	182
Principals	1		1	10	12
Counselors	2		2	6	10
Nurses	5	1		3	9
Physical Education Teachers				11	11
Art and Music Teachers				15	15
Social Workers	6	1	2	0	9
Librarians				3	3
Advanced Placement					
Gifted Education	1		1	1	3
Intervention Spec.	12	2	2	0	16
Bilingual Education	5	2	2	1	10
Ed. Assistants	10			44	54
Sp. Ed. Teachers (excluding gifted)	2			29	31
Ancillary and Support Staff				3	3**
M and O Staff				50	50
Data Entry Clerks				6	6
Other C O Staff			1	29	30
Other School-based Staff	2	1		38	41

**** May require contracted services**

Accountability:

The legislation introduced during the 2008 session to change the public school funding formula utilizes the Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) as the means of ensuring accountability with regard to districts providing a sufficient educational program for all students that includes not only the basic required academic programs, such as reading, writing, and math, but also programs such as bilingual-multicultural education, physical education, arts and music, and gifted programs. In short, PED is required to disapprove any budget for a district or charter school that cannot show in its EPSS that it is offering all required programs.

7. Do you believe that the EPSS is the appropriate mechanism to tie together budget approval and program delivery? If not, what means would you suggest be used as an alternative to ensure accountability?

The Educational Plan for Student Success is a mechanism that provides a

clear, concise format for measuring accountability. It is data driven and monitored quarterly for needed adjustments. It allows schools and districts to tailor instruction to meet the unique needs of our children.

Staff Salaries:

The proposed funding formula would replace the current Training and Experience (T&E) Index with the Index of Staff Qualifications (ISQ). Although both indexes are designed to distribute additional funding to districts and charter schools based on the composition of their instructional staff, they are not identical:

- The T&E calculation is based on years of service and academic degrees for all instructional staff but does not reflect the three-tiered licensure system for teachers.
- The ISQ calculation recognizes not only experience and academic degrees but also licensure levels. It was calibrated on the average teacher salaries for each of the three levels and distributes additional dollars based on the proportion of teachers in each of those levels. In addition, there is a second calculation for those instructional staff, such as counselors, who are not included in the three-tiered system. Because the base per-student cost upon which the proposed formula is based already reflects the average salary by personnel category in the average district, the ISQ is applied only to salary costs in a district or charter school that are beyond the average.

8. If you have calculated your district's ISQ using the most recent matrices in the bill (see Attachment 2), how would this factor impact funding for your district?

The ISQ funding formula would have an adverse impact within the Grants/Cibola County School District. The T & E of 1.141 will drop to the ISQ of 1.000 resulting in a decrease of funding.

Special Education:

9. Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as in need of special education, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent? **(Do not include gifted students.)**

Number: 515 Percentage: @14%

10. How will the proposed funding formula's use of a fixed special education identification rate of 16 percent impact special education funding for your district?

Grants/Cibola County Schools would not receive supplemental funding because we are too close to the cutoff of 16%.

Gifted Education:

11. Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as gifted, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent?

Number: 67

Percentage: <2%

12. Even though the bill as amended during the session does not require districts to consider students that have been identified as gifted to be in need of special education, it does require that these students be served. How will your district specifically address the needs of students identified as gifted?

Currently, the district serves the identified gifted students through 1.5 certified teachers. The plan is to increase the number of teachers for gifted students to 3 expanding an enriched curriculum to guide student needs.

Revenue Sources for Implementation:

13. What revenue sources for the additional dollars needed to reach sufficiency would your district support?

Grants/Cibola County Schools supports at least 50% of the General Fund be allocated to education. Additionally, interest from the Permanent Fund should also be allocated to education.

Potential Problems:

14. What problems, if any, does your district anticipate will arise from the implementation of the proposed funding formula?

The district does not see any problems associated with the implementation of the additional funding, only opportunities for the students.

15. What problems, if any, does your district anticipate will arise if the proposed funding formula is not implemented?

The district will continue to have difficulty meeting the needs of our culturally diverse population. An additional challenge would be to maintain an appropriate cash balance which would impact the District's bonding capacity as well as the inability to implement PED mandates. Professional Development of staff and implementation of programs necessary to provide interventions for students will be restricted and continue to be funded solely from supplemental funding (i.e. Title 1, Title 11, etc.).

16. Please feel free to identify any other issues that have not been addressed in these questions that you feel the committee should be aware of.

If this sufficiency funding becomes a reality, it will initiate true school reform. The Grants/Cibola County School District is committed to true school reform by partnering with other school agencies within Cibola County. We are currently working under the guidance of an MOU with the following non-public schools educational agencies:

Laguna Department of Education, Sky City Community School, and Saint Joseph Mission School. Within our county it is NOT uncommon for families to have students enrolled in 2 or more educational agencies at any given time.

xc: Legislative Education Study Committee

PROPOSED PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA: SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND CHARTER SCHOOLS

<i>Location: Roswell</i> May 12-14		<i>Location: Albuquerque</i> June 9-11		<i>Location: Kirtland</i> August 6		<i>Location: Raton</i> September 8-10		<i>Location: Deming</i> October 8-10		<i>Location: Santa Fe</i> November 19-21	
District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM
Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1	
Artesia	3,548.5	Albuquerque	88,271.5	Central Consolidated	6,614.5	Las Vegas City	2,085.5	Alamogordo	6,321.0	Albuquerque	88,271.5
Clovis	8,035.0	Los Lunas	8,561.0	Farmington	10,189.5	Raton	1,360.5	Gadsden	13,955.5	Santa Fe	12,266.0
Hobbs	7,809.5	Rio Rancho	15,577.0	Gallup-McKinley	12,159.0	Taos	2,795.0	Las Cruces	23,559.5		
Lovington	3,084.0					West Las Vegas	1,703.5				
Portales	2,773.0										
Roswell	9,373.5										
Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2	
Capitan	536.5	Belen	4,749.5	Aztec	3,064.5	Cimarron	450.0	Carlsbad	5,905.5	Espanola	4,309.0
Cloudcroft	461.0	Bernalillo	3,176.0	Bloomfield	3,096.5	Clayton	539.5	Cobre	1,396.5	Los Alamos	3,444.0
Dexter	1,097.0	Estancia	1,005.0	Grants-Cibola	3,698.0	Mora	567.5	Deming	5,418.0	Pojoaque	2,019.5
Eunice	570.5	Moriarty	3,590.5	Zuni	1,505.0	Questa	434.5	Hatch Valley	1,428.0	Ruidoso	2,273.5
Hagerman	448.0	Socorro	1,722.5					Silver Consolidated	3,091.5	Tucuman	1,045.0
Jal	405.0							Truth or Consequences	1,392.0		
Loving	570.5										
Texico	526.0										
Group 3		Group 3		Group 3		Group 3		Group 3		Group 3	
Camizozo	215.5	Corona	84.5	Cuba	695.0	Des Moines	94.0	Animas	257.0	Chama	454.0
Dora	225.5	Jemez Valley	326.5	Dulce	691.0	Maxwell	102.0	Lordsburg	680.0	Jemez Mountain	343.0
Elida	120.5	Magdalena	428.5			Mosquero	38.0	Reserve	185.0	Logan	231.0
Floyd	243.5	Mountainair	339.0			Roy	79.0	Tularosa	959.0	Mesa Vista	437.0
Fort Sumner	304.5	Quemado	186.0			Springer	195.0			Pecos	714.0
Grady	121.5					Wagon Mound	148.5			Peñasco	547.5
Hondo Valley	121.5	Group 4								San Jon	149.5
House	107.0	Aldo Leopold, Silver City								Santa Rosa	654.0
Lake Arthur	148.0	Creative Ed. Prep. Inst. 1, Albuquerque								Vaughn	103.5
Melrose	208.5	Deming Cesar Chavez, Deming									
Tatum	292.5	Digital Arts & Tech. Acad., Albuquerque									
		El Camino Real, Albuquerque									
		Middle College High School, Gallup									
		Mosaic Academy, Aztec									
		Nuestros Valores, Albuquerque									
		Rio Gallinas School, West Las Vegas									
		Sidney Gutierrez Middle School, Roswell									
		SW Secondary Learning, Albuquerque									
		Taos Charter School, Taos									
		Turquoise Trail, Santa Fe									
		Wakarusa, Jemez Pueblo									

NOTE: The district groupings are based on 2007-2008 40-day membership.

ATTACHMENT 2

ISQ-A – Teachers, Including Librarians

Level I																	
Year's Within Level	0 – 1			2 – 3			4 – 5					Total	Total				
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE			FTE	Adjusted FTE				
Bachelor's	22.00	0.64	14.08	8.67	0.67	5.81	13.80	0.71	9.80			44.47	29.69				
Master's	2.00	0.68	1.36	2.00	0.72	1.44	2.33	0.76	1.77			6.33	4.57				
Master's + 45/Post-Masters		0.71	0.00		0.75	0.00	0.00	0.79	0.00			0.00	0.00				
Total	24.00		15.44	10.67		7.25	16.13		11.57			50.80	34.26				
Level II																	
Year's Within Level	4 – 6			7 – 8			9 – 15			Over 15					Total	Total	
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE			FTE	Adjusted FTE	
Bachelor's	13.80	0.76	10.49	8.00	0.82	6.56	25.00	0.93	23.25	21.33	1.04	22.18			68.13	62.48	
Master's	1.00	0.81	0.81	7.00	0.88	6.16	15.30	1.00	15.30	38.00	1.11	42.18			61.30	64.45	
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	1.00	0.85	0.85	1.00	0.92	0.92		1.05	0.00	7.60	1.16	8.82	9.60	10.59			
Total	15.80		12.15	16.00		13.64	40.30		38.55	66.93		73.18	139.03	137.52			
Level III																	
Year's Within Level	7 – 8			9 – 15			Over 15							Total	Total		
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE					FTE	Adjusted FTE		
Bachelor's		0.90	0.00		1.02	0.00		1.17	0.00							0.00	0.00
Master's	4.00	0.96	3.84	15.00	1.09	16.35	19.63	1.25	24.54							38.63	44.73
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	2.00	1.01	2.02	3.50	1.14	3.99	22.87	1.31	29.96			28.37	35.97				
Total	6.00		5.86	18.50		20.34	42.50		54.50				67.00	80.70			
													Matrix Totals	256.83	252.47		

ISQ-B – Other Instructional Staff

Years of Experience	0 – 2			3 – 5			6 – 8			9 – 15			Over 15			Total	Total	
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Adjusted FTE	
Bachelor's or Less		0.65	0.00		0.78	0.00		0.87	0.00		0.91	0.00		0.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Bachelor's + 15		0.70	0.00		0.83	0.00		0.87	0.00		0.96	0.00		1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Master's/Bachelor's + 45		0.74	0.00	1.00	0.87	0.87		0.91	0.00		1.00	0.00		1.04	0.00	1.00	0.87	
Master's + 15		0.78	0.00		0.91	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.13	0.00	1.50	1.17	1.76	2.50	2.76	
Master's + 45/Post-Masters		0.87	0.00		1.00	0.00		1.13	0.00		1.22	0.00	3.00	1.30	3.90	3.00	3.90	
Total	0.00		0.00	1.00		0.87	1.00		1.00	0.00		0.00	4.50		5.66	6.50	7.53	
															Matrix Totals		6.50	7.53

GRAND TOTAL (ISQ-A + ISQ-B) 263.33 260.00
RAW INDEX OF STAFF QUALIFICATIONS 1.00